



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/670,547	09/25/2003	Peter Groz	HSJ920030143US1	5490
42640 75	590 12/14/2005		EXAMINER	
DILLON & Y	UDELL LLP		TON, D	AVID
8911 NORTH (SUITE 2110	CAPITAL OF TEXAS	HWY	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
AUSTIN, TX	78759		2138	

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/670,547	GROZ, PETER	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		David Ton	2138	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence addre	9SS
WHIC - Exte- after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANS IN THE MAILING DANS IN THE MAILING DANS IN THE MAILING DANS IN THE MONTHS FROM THE MAILING DANS IN THE MONTHS FROM THE MAILING DANS IN THE MONTHS FROM THE MONTHS FROM THE MONTHS	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to the second will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDON	N. imely filed in the mailing date of this comm ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
	Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL. 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pr		nerits is
.		x parte Quayle, 1900 C.D. 11, 4	55 O.G. 215.	
· _	ion of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.		,
Applicati	ion Papers			
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on 12 July 2004 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the confection to the confection to the confection of the confect	☑ accepted or b)☐ objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se on is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). Djected to. See 37 CFR	` '
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priorical application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicative documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Sta	age
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔯 Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/25/03</u> .	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:		52)

Application/Control Number: 10/670,547 Page 2

Art Unit: 2138

1. The first paragraph on page 1 of the specification (paragraph [0001]) is objected to because the serial number and filing date of correlated application are missing

to because the serial number and filing date of co-related application are missing.

2. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC ' 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made

to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was

made.

4. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over

Yu et al. (Yu) patent no. 6,263,303, in view of Ackerman et al. (Ackerman) patent no.

5,146,460.

5. As to claim 1, Yu teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including a

method for performing testing of a simulated device [digital hardware system, col. 1

lines 4-6] in a testing simulation environment [col. 1 lines 9-20], said method comprising:

providing a software representation [module 16 of Fig. 2] of a plurality of

hardware components within said simulated direct access storage device [see Fig. 7A];

Application/Control Number: 10/670,547

Art Unit: 2138

providing a control program module [core 18 of Fig. 2] within said testing simulation environment, wherein said control program module interacts with said

software representation of said plurality of hardware components [see claim 35];

providing a testing program [see program flowchart of Fig. 5D] for interacting with

said control program module and said software representation of said plurality of

hardware components:

in response to detection of an occurrence of a pre-selected event [event

triggered 100 of Fig. 5C] within said simulated direct access storage device, sending

[see EVENT(2) of Fig. 2] one or more codes [claim 31] from said testing program to said

software representation of said plurality of hardware components [see claim 3]; and

determining whether or not a response by said control program module to said

one or more codes is correct [col. 3 lines 10-13].

However, Yu does not explicitly teach the simulated device is a simulated direct

access storage device.

However, a direct access storage device is a well known component in a digital

hardware system such as the direct access storage 80 of Fig. 2B disclosed by

Ackerman [col. 7 lines 36-47].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at

the time of the invention was made to apply the behavior simulation for simulating a

digital hardware system taught by Yu for simulation a simulated direct access storage

device as taught by Ackerman. This modification would have been obvious and a

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 10/670,547

Art Unit: 2138

person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because it would enhance the application of Yu invention.

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 10/670,547 Page 5

Art Unit: 2138

6. As to claim 2, Yu teaches the hardware component comprises a microprocessor [[col. 1 lines 9-20].

- 7. As to claims 3-4, Ackerman teaches codes represent software error event [software simulation of an error condition, col. 3 lines 31-38].
- 8. As to claim 5, Yu teaches the testing program is a behavior simulation program [col. Col. 1 lines 20-37].
- 9. As to claim 6, Yu teaches codes comprise one or more predefined stimuli [see claim 16].
- 10. As to claim 7, Yu teaches the testing program simulates the hardware components processing the codes in real-time [see claim 25].
- 11. As to claim 8, Yu teaches the control program-under-development [col. 1 lines 9-20].
- 12. As to claims 9-10, Yu teaches one or more code target one or more elements of the control program module and hardware components [claim 41].
- 13. As to claim 11, Yu teaches the pre-selected event return a value [see elements 128-130 of Fig. 5D].
- 14. As to claim 12, Yu teaches the pre-selected event comprises a memory register [memory device of claim 22].
- 15. As to claim 13, Yu teaches sending comprises writing a value to a memory register in the component [step 130 of Fig. 5D].

Application/Control Number: 10/670,547 Page 6

Art Unit: 2138

16. As to claim 14, Ackerman teaches recording the response [element 18 of Fig. 1A

and claim 1].

17. As to claim 15, Ackerman teaches codes are stored in a testing event data

structure in detail file 80 of Fig. 2B [the script file is well known in the art for running a

segment executable program, see patent no. 6,106,298 or 6,208,955 cited on PTO

892].

18. As to claim 16, Ackerman teaches reporting the response [inherently in "create

the necessary detailed trace information required for problem analysis" on col. 1 lines 8-

21].

19. As to claim 17, Yu teaches pre-selected event includes the passage of a

predefined length of time [delay stimulus of claim 22].

20. As to claim 18, Ackerman teaches a return value not matching a predefined

value [see COMPARISON MISMATCH of Fig. 2A].

21. As to claim 19, Yu teaches the pre-selected event comprises the control program

module executing a pre-selected instruction [see fig. 5D].

22. As to claim 20, it is a combination of claims 1-19 above; therefore, it is rejected

under the same rationale.

Conclusion

Application/Control Number: 10/670,547

Art Unit: 2138

23. The prior art of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to David Ton whose telephone number is (571) 272-3828.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th from 5:30 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Albert DeCady can be reached on (571) 272-3819. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Ton

avidion

Primary Examiner

Page 7

Art Unit 2138